



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

*THE "STANDARD BIBLE DICTIONARY"*<sup>1</sup>

This dictionary has been prepared because Hastings's Dictionary of the Bible and the Encyclopaedia Biblica have been found too "discursive" for handy use. It is intended for educated ministers, who "have not always the leisure to enter into a discursive presentation of critical research"; for Sunday-school teachers and workers; and for intelligent laymen interested in Bible study. To serve such readers, the dictionary should be accurate but not technical; "it should be up to the day in its information, but not so discursive as to burden its pages with the pedantry of undigested facts."

There is undoubtedly a place for a dictionary of the Bible in one volume—otherwise we should not have been blessed with three of them in one year, not to mention the resuscitation of another. Whether such a work can be made to serve the needs of so varied a constituency may, however, be doubted. The educated minister who wants seriously to study a subject will often find this dictionary insufficient in itself, and, through the absence of any systematic indication of the literature, useless as a guide to further inquiry. The ordinary Sunday-school teacher or "intelligent layman," on the other hand, will find it too big and repellently learned. Suppose, for example, that such a reader consults the article on Greek and Roman Idolatry; he will be edified to learn that "the old sacred tree-trunks . . . and stones, usually of meteoric origin, were called *ζόανα* [*sic*], and these *ζόανα* [*sic*] continued to be the real cult object," etc.; also that a sacred stone set up under a sacred tree "was called a *βαίτυλος* by the Greeks." The layman who, asking for bread, is given a stone like this may be tempted to murmur "pedantry," while those who can read the Greek, after tacitly correcting the mis-

<sup>1</sup>A Standard Bible Dictionary, designed as a comprehensive guide to the Scriptures, embracing their languages, literature, history, biography, manners and customs, and their theology. Edited by M. W. Jacobus, E. E. Nourse, and A. C. Zenos, in association with American, British, and German scholars. Large 8vo, pp. 920. New York: Funk & Wagnalls Company. 1909.

prints, will justly complain that no references to Greek authors are given in support of assertions about the names of sacred stones which seem to have no warrant in usage.

In the Standard Dictionary, as in the new Hastings, the one-volume minister has been more in the mind of the authors and editors than the layman. A dictionary specially adapted to Sunday-school teachers and ordinary readers of the Bible is still to be made.

Taking the work as a short cut to information for busy ministers, it is to be said at once that it will answer this purpose very well. The selection of entry-titles is a combination of the dictionary and the encyclopaedia principles, such subjects as Agriculture, Artisan Life, Trade and Commerce, Dress and Ornaments, Burial and Burial Customs, Law, Crimes and Punishments, Marriage and Divorce, Family, etc., being treated in comprehensive articles with references from the natural dictionary entries. The concordance basis results in some omissions. Thus the emperors Tiberius and Claudius are included, but there is no article on Nero because his name does not happen to occur in the New Testament; though in the New Testament history Nero is a much more important figure than either of the others, and is more frequently referred to. The concordance is not, however, responsible for the absence of "Caesar," under which head a reader of Acts 25 would look for an answer to the question who the emperor was to whom Paul appealed.

There are more serious faults of omission than these. The religions of the Greek and Roman world in the first century of the Christian era are of at least as much importance to the understanding of the New Testament as Semitic religion to that of the Old Testament. There is promise in the preface of an article on the subject; but all that we find is one—mainly irrelevant—on Greek and Roman Idolatry. The reader will look in vain for an article on Judaism at the beginning of the Christian era. To make the matter worse, the article Pharisees is almost wholly given up to the external history of the sect, with no account of their teachings; the few sentences on their religious character are altogether unsatisfactory. The articles on Biblical theology (with a few exceptions, such as Eschatology) entirely ignore con-

temporary Jewish thought. A striking example is the article on God (by W. D. Mackenzie): after setting forth the Old Testament "doctrine" of God—with no reference even to the later development, as represented, for example, in Daniel—the author proceeds: "When we pass to the N T we find ourselves in a new world made for us by a new religion. The change is due to the creative personality of Jesus Christ." Biblical ethics is also a subject which would seem to fall properly within the scope of a Bible dictionary. Suppose an inquirer to ask, What are the standards and motives of moral conduct in the Old Testament or the New, and how are the latter related to Jewish teaching? why should he not find information on this point in the dictionary as well as, say, on Sacrifice or on Magic? Here, again, the lack of a connected treatment is not made good under special topics: there is no article on Retribution; Reward is a barren list of Hebrew and Greek words; Sin and Righteousness are theological disquisitions. It is the signal fault of Bible dictionaries—not peculiar to this one—that they conscientiously tithe the mint, anise, and cumin of antiquities to the comparative neglect of weightier matters; and the disproportion is the more serious the smaller the scale of the work. In the present volume there are also many articles which are mere gleanings from the concordance (see, e.g., Favor, Light, Path, Prince, etc.), of no discernible use unless to the student of the Hebrew or Greek text, who presumably keeps concordances of his own.

The authors are chiefly Americans, but there are several well-known foreign contributors. Nowack writes on various archaeological subjects; Guthe furnishes the long article on Palestine, and on Marriage and Divorce; v. Dobschütz on the New Testament Text; Lake on the New Testament Canon; Driver on Chronicles and on Jeremiah; König on the Old Testament Canon and on Isaiah; James Denney on Jesus Christ and on Paul; Doctor Post, of Beirut, on Diseases and Remedies, etc. Among the American contributors special mention may be made of articles by McCurdy on Egypt, Assyria, Babylonia, Israel, Semitic Religion; by J. R. S. Sterrett on Asia Minor, and on many subjects in the field of New Testament geography and Greek and Roman history and antiquities; Paton on Jerusalem and on the

Old Testament Text; W. D. Mackenzie on subjects in Biblical theology (from the theological rather than the historical point of view). A large part of the articles have been written by the three editors: Jacobus has dealt chiefly with the New Testament literature and kindred subjects; Nourse furnishes most of the articles on the books of the Old Testament and many on biographical and archaeological subjects; Zenos's astounding versatility is displayed in a vast number of articles in the most diverse fields.

In general the articles display competent scholarship; some of them are by men of acknowledged mastery in their domain. Some, however, bear the mark of hasty compilation, and are afflicted with a corresponding inaccuracy. For example, on page 88, we are told that the Apocalypse of Baruch was discovered and published in a Latin translation in 1866, "and later in a more primitive Syriac text in 1871," the fact being that Ceriani's Latin of 1866 was his own translation of the Syriac manuscript which he edited in 1871; on page 868 it is asserted that in later Judaism two tithes were paid "of the product of both soil and cattle." Novel or eccentric opinions are sometimes incautiously accepted, as when Klostermann's unhappy conceit that Aceldama (Ἀκελδαμαχ), Acts 1 19, is the transliteration of an Aramaic word meaning 'field of sleep' (cemetery), not 'field of blood' (Mt. 27 8 Acts 1 19), is given as the true explanation of the name.

An example of another kind is the article on the Phasisees (see especially p. 667 B): "They recognized God not only as a law-giver, but also as loving Israel, and along with their *halākōth* they developed a theory of the 'evil impulse' . . . and a code of morality, known as the 'Two Ways,' which appears later in the Didache." "With Him [Jesus], God was the Father, to be obeyed through love; according to the Pharisees, God was primarily the Law-giver, to be obeyed through fear (Gal. 2 3-5, 5 1, 6 13; Rom. 8 14; 2 John 1 7)." The reader will find it instructive to look up these references, especially those in Galatians; it may occur to him to ask why the Christian opposition to Paul's antinomianism should be alleged to show how the Pharisees thought of God.

If there had been an article on Father in Heaven—why is there not?—or if the article on the Lord's Prayer had been less superficial, it would have appeared that the conception of God as the heavenly Father was by no means specifically Christian; if in the article Prayer any notice had been taken of Jewish custom, it would be plain that the Jew who repeated Deut. 6 4 ff.—“Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart,” etc.—before his morning and evening prayers, taking upon himself thus “the yoke of the Kingdom of Heaven” before “the yoke of the commandments”—that is, acknowledging the constitutive obligation of religion before its specific duties—was not unmindful of the fact that the essence of the religious relation of man to God is love; if ethics had found any place in the dictionary, it would probably have been noted that the rabbis insistently taught that God should not be served with the thought of reward, nor with any self-regarding motive, but “for his own sake.”

There are many well-made and generally well-chosen illustrations in line and in half-tone; the collection of modern Palestinian agricultural implements, household utensils, musical instruments, etc., at Hartford Seminary has been largely drawn upon. For the benefit of a second edition it may be pointed out that the specimen of Samaritan script on page 28 is upside down; to most users of the dictionary it is doubtless as profitable that way as any other.

The editors of the one-volume Hastings decline as hopeless the attempt to indicate the English pronunciation of Old Testament names; in the volume before us the pronunciations are given on the authority of the Standard Dictionary. It must be understood, however, that these pronunciations frequently do not represent usage, but arbitrary rules or perilous analogies; thus, the reader may have his choice among three ways of pronouncing Ittai—every possible way except the obviously right one.

The transliteration of Hebrew words (“slightly (!) different from that in general use”) aims “to enable the English reader to understand, as easily as possible, how the Hebrew words should be pronounced.” We should be surprised if the “English reader” could make head or tail out of this perversely complicated system; it may be some consolation in his defeat to know that he has

escaped learning how to mispronounce Hebrew horribly. Like the American Revisers, whose self-styled Standard American Edition with its "Jehovah" it follows, the Dictionary seems to have a leaning "to gods whom they know not, to new gods that came newly up." The article Jehovah explains that the Hebrew name is written *y'hōwāh*, "but properly *yāhweh*." This new god is not the invention of the printer's devil, for the name occurs repeatedly (see, e.g., pp. 296, 389, 390, 571 f.), and an attempt is even made to do it into Hebrew characters, which, however, gets no nearer to it than *Yohweh*. The latter is at least an imaginable Hebrew form: according to one popular interpretation of Jahveh, "He who brings into existence," *Johveh* would be "the god who is brought into existence"—by dictionary makers!

The publisher's part of the work is excellently done; the print is good, and typographical devices to facilitate reference are skillfully employed. A few misprints have escaped the corrector's eye: *Baba Megilla*, *Baba Sabbath*, etc. (p. 600 and elsewhere); Sybilline Oracles (p. 41); Gambinius (p. 156). *Mēhōl* (circumciser, p. 136) and *ḥōbhrē shāmayīm* (p. 71, "the Hebrew word for astrologers") are probably not the fault of the proof-reader.

G. F. MOORE.

HARVARD UNIVERSITY.